

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated December 7, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1–21 are pending, with claims 14-21 being withdrawn from consideration. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3–7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,597,416 to Momose et al. (hereinafter “Momose”); claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,336,535 to Fukuchi et al. (hereinafter “Fukuchi”); claims 8–9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose and U.S. Patent No. 5,9084,294 to Bogomolny (hereinafter “Bogomolny”); claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,388,729 to Ahn et al. (hereinafter “Ahn”); and claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose and U.S. Patent No. 5,670,994 to Kawaguchi et al. (hereinafter “Kawaguchi”).

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3–7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Momose. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 1 and request reconsideration. Independent claim 1 is allowable in that it recites “a fixing device for inserting a digitizer.” Nothing in Momose teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

The Examiner cites reference 16 of Momose (FIG. 1A) as teaching a fixing device (Office Action, p. 3). Applicants respectfully disagree and point out that reference 16 refers to a “flexible interconnection board” that is “electrically connected to the panel terminals of the liquid crystal panel.” (Col. 7, ll. 65–66; and col. 8, ll. 32–34). The Examiner states that “if the prior art use is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.” (Office Action, p. 2). Applicants respectfully assert that one or ordinary skill would not use the flexible interconnection board 16 having “interconnection terminals ... disposed in an array fashion on the flexible interconnection board 16” (col. 7, ll. 64–67) as a fixing device. Referring to the

specification, “[t]he digitizer 40 is inserted after the assembling process of the fixing device 41 and the LCD (liquid crystal module) 10. The fixing device 41 being closely adhered has a narrow space for receiving the digitizer 40, thereby avoiding direct contact with the PCB (printed circuit board) 45.” (¶ 93). Further, without the fixing device, “when a strong shock is applied to the liquid crystal display device having the digitizer or when the lifted PCB (printed circuit board) is touched during the manufacturing process, the TCP or the PCB may be damaged.” (¶ 65) As such, a flexible interconnection board, or any other printed circuit board, could not serve as a fixing device as claimed in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, and its dependent claims 3–7 and 10, are allowable over Momose.

In the Office Action, claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose in view of Fukuchi. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 2 and request reconsideration. Claim 2, which depends from independent claim 1, is allowable in that Fukuchi fails to cure the deficiency of Momose to teach or suggest the “fixing device for inserting a digitizer” of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2, as it depends from claim 1, is allowable over any combination of Momose and Fukuchi.

In the Office Action, claims 8–9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose and Bogomolny. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 8–9 and 12 and request reconsideration. Claims 8–9 and 12, which depend from independent claim 1, are allowable in that Bogomolny fails to cure the deficiency of Momose to teach or suggest the “fixing device for inserting a digitizer” of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8–9 and 12, as they depend from claim 1, are allowable over any combination of Momose and Bogomolny.

In the Office Action, claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose in view of Ahn. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 11 and request reconsideration. Claim 11, which depends from claim 1, is allowable in that Ahn fails to cure the deficiency of Momose to teach or suggest the “fixing device for inserting a digitizer” of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit

that claim 11, as it depends from claim 1, is allowable over any combination of Momose and Ahn.

In the Office Action, claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose and Kawaguchi. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 13 and request reconsideration. Claim 13, which depends from independent claim 1, is allowable because Kawaguchi fails to cure the deficiency of Momose to teach or suggest the “fixing device for inserting a digitizer” of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13, as it depends from claim 1, is allowable over any combination of Momose and Kawaguchi.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Application No.: 10/736,665  
Amendment filed on June 6, 2006  
Reply to Final Office Action dated December 7, 2005

Docket No.: 8734.275.00-US

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: June 6, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes  
Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorney for Applicants